

**REMARKS**

**Summary of Office Action**

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. (US Pat. No. 6,122,024) in view of Sakai et al. (US Pat. No. 6,222,603).

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sakai et al., and further in view of Hiji et al. (US Pat. No. 5,872,609).

**Summary of Amendment**

Claim 11 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Hence, claims 11-18 and 22 are pending for consideration.

**Form 1449 (SECOND REQUEST)**

As requested in the previously filed response, Applicant requests that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 10, 2006 be considered and an copy of an initialed PTO Form 1449 be returned as evidence of the consideration.

**All Claims Comply Under §103**

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sakai et al. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sakai et al., and further in view of Hiji et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites, in part, a “wherein the photo-reactant material and the liquid crystal material form a polymer network such that the photo-reactant material is aligned by light *irradiated to cure the first and second sealant* and the liquid crystal material is

aligned by the light *irradiated to cure the first and second sealant.*" (Emphasis added.) Molsen et al. fails to teach or such a feature. Moreover, Sakai et al. does not and cannot cure at least this deficiency. Therefore, Molsen et al. and Sakai et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach all the features of independent claim 11. Additionally, claims 12-18 depend from claim 11, thereby incorporating all the features of claim 11. Accordingly, Molsen et al. and Sakai et al., whether taken individually or in combination, also fail to teach all the features of claims 12-18 for at least the reason discussed above.

Claim 22 also depends from independent claim 11, thereby incorporating all the features of claim 11. Hiji et al. cannot and does not cure at least the deficiency discussed above. Therefore, Molsen et al., Sakai et al., and Hiji et al., whether taken individually or in combination, also fail to teach all the features of claim 22 for at least the reason discussed above.

# # # # #

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

Kyle J. Choi

Reg. No. 41,480

Dated: May 8, 2007

**Customer No.: 009626**

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202.739.3000  
Facsimile: 202.739.3001